

an ORD is translated to a contract specification, "things" can get lost. *Keep Your Eye on the Requirements.*

Contractor access to the approved TEMP (with contractual or financial information redacted) is sensible. The TEMP is a program office document, however, and its control is the program office's responsibility and prerogative. Access to approved OT test plans makes sense too. Our standard procedure is to offer the program manager a brief on the test plan after it has been approved, and the contractor might find benefit in attending. For some reason, our experience has been that program managers generally decline this brief.

Industry observer participation in IPTs [Integrated Product Teams] is also an issue not in the control of the Navy OT community. Program managers charter IPTs, and they or their empowered representative chairs them. We are invited participants and have no control of or

influence on whom is allowed to attend, observe, or participate. It seems reasonable to include industry representatives to comply with OSD [Office of the Secretary of Defense] and Navy acquisition reform initiatives of partnering with industry.

With regard to providing early test data to industry, the current procedure for Navy OT is to provide the program manager, as expeditiously as possible, all data relating to a system failure or anomaly discovered during OT. We accomplished this by sending an anomaly message from COMOPTEVFOR to the program manager. The program office restricts us from interfacing directly with industry developers. This prevents the possibility of perceived tasking to correct or investigate the cause of an anomaly. Direct operational tester feedback to industry developers might be misconstrued as the tester setting a requirement for the system through informal discussions. We do not want to be placed

in a position of defending a casual "It would be nice if the system could..." type remark that the developer mistakenly construes as a requirement to pass testing.

Some Contractors' Involvement Is Legal and Can be Beneficial

Industry, Program Managers, and Operational Testers all can benefit from the open communication advocated by Col. Stoddart – but we must be realistic in our expectations of improvements in quality, economy, and efficiency. Our decision to proceed with this initiative is grounded solely in the belief that the potential for "good" (more effective and suitable equipment in the Fleet) outweighs that for "bad" (perception of loss of "independence" in operational test and evaluation).

Editor's Note: The authors welcome questions or comments on this article. Contact Whitehead at WhiteheS@cotf.navy.mil.

PENTAGON SEEKS IDEAS ON COMBATING TERRORISM

The Department of Defense announced today [Oct. 25, 2001] that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics and the Combating Terrorism Technology Support Office Technical Support Working Group are jointly sponsoring a Broad Agency Announcement (BAA) asking for help in fighting terrorism.

The BAA, issued Oct. 23 (No. 02-Q-4655), specifically seeks help in combating terrorism, defeating difficult targets, conducting protracted operations in remote areas, and developing countermeasures to weapons of mass destruction. Its objective is to find concepts that can be developed and fielded within 12 to 18 months.

The BAA provides for a three-phase process in which interested parties initially submit a one-page description of their concept. Initial responses are due by Dec. 23, 2001. After a review of a submission and if DoD is interested in further information, the sub-

mitter will then be asked to provide a more detailed description of up to 12 pages of the idea. Submitters of concepts that the Department is not interested in pursuing further will be so notified.

DoD will evaluate phase two submissions and ask those who have offered the most promising ideas to submit full proposals in a third phase that may form the basis for a contract. Phase two submitters who are not asked to submit full proposals will be so notified. Submitters of a full phase three proposal that is not accepted by the Department may request a formal debriefing. Debriefings will not be provided to phase one and phase two submitters whose concepts were not accepted.

Interested parties can obtain more information concerning this BAA by visiting <http://www.bids.tswg.gov>.

Editor's Note: This information is in the public domain at <http://www.defenselink.mil/news>.